



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,414	04/21/2002	Sharon Flank	EMTNP001-6	9904
21121	7590	07/06/2004	EXAMINER	
OPPEDAHL AND LARSON LLP P O BOX 5068 DILLON, CO 80435-5068			COBY, FRANTZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2171	7

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/063,414

Applicant(s)

FLANK ET AL.

Examiner

Frantz Coby

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to application filed on April 21, 2002 in which claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed May 06, 2002 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains language that implies "the invention concerns". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai et al. U.S. Patent no. 6,072,904 in view of Schultz U.S. Patent no. 5,721,902.

As per claim 1, Desai et al. disclose "a method for use with a system storing digital media records and comprising a search engine searching said stored digital media records, the method comprising the steps of: receiving search requests from users; logging the search requests; applying a statistical clustering algorithm, thereby

Art Unit: 2171

grouping similar search requests together; identifying, using a semantic net hierarchy, a lowest-level term in the hierarchy that subsumes all of the queries in a grouping of search requests; communicating the identified term to a user" by providing a graphical based image retrieval system (See Desai et al. Abstract, Col. 2, lines 22-38; Col. 4, lines 34-60; Col. 5, lines 56-63).

It is noted, however, Desai et al. did not specifically detail the aspect of "expanding the search requests" as recited in the instant claims 1, 4, 7 and 10. On the other hand, Schultz achieved the aforementioned limitations by providing an expansion of query terms using part of speech tagging (See Schultz Title; Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify image retrieval system of Desai et al. by incorporating, in the search mechanism of Desai et al. the query expansion method of Schultz. The motivation being to provide a searching/retrieval system which can query a library or database and identify not only text documents, but also multi-media files stores on the library of database that are relevant to the query (See Schultz Col. 2, lines 57-61).

As per claims 4, 7 and 10, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claims 2-3, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Schultz discloses the claimed features of "wherein the expanding is

performed using a thesaurus”; “wherein the expanding is performed using a semantic net comprising synonyms and super-terms” (See Schultz Figures 4A-4C) especially “Thesaurus” and “Dictionary”.

As per claims 5-6, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 4. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, Schultz discloses the claimed features of “wherein the expanding is performed using a thesaurus”; “wherein the expanding is performed using a semantic net comprising synonyms and super-terms” (See Schultz Figures 4A-4C) especially “Thesaurus” and “Dictionary”.

As per claims 8-9, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 7 above. In addition, Schultz discloses the claimed features of “wherein the expanding is performed using a thesaurus”; “wherein the expanding is performed using a semantic net comprising synonyms and super-terms” (See Schultz Figures 4A-4C) especially “Thesaurus” and “Dictionary”.

As per claims 11-12, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Schultz discloses the claimed features of “wherein the expanding is performed using a thesaurus”; “wherein the expanding is performed using a semantic

net comprising synonyms and super-terms" (See Schultz Figures 4A-4C) especially "Thesaurus" and "Dictionary".

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai et al. U.S. Patent no. 6,072,904 in view of Schultz U.S. Patent no. 5,721,902 and further in view of Wiser et al.

As per claims 13-15, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above.

It is noted, however, neither Desai et al. nor Schultz disclose the aspects of "wherein a user expressing interest in a selected digital media record comprises the user placing the selected digital media record into an online shopping cart"; "wherein a user expressing interest in a selected digital media record comprises the user purchasing rights to use the selected digital media record"; "wherein a user expressing interest in a selected digital media record comprises the user placing the selected digital media record into an online projects folder or other work space". On the other hand, Wiser achieved the aforementioned claimed features by providing a secure online music distribution system including a media licensing mechanism as well as a payment mechanism to allow online purchasing of digital media (See Wiser et al. Figures 6A-6B).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the combination of Desai et al. and Schultz by further

Art Unit: 2171


incorporating the online music distribution teachings of Wiser et al. because that would have enhanced the versatility of Desai's et al. image retrieval method by allowing it to be applied in an electronic commerce environment.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 703 305-4006. The examiner can normally be reached on Maxi-Flex (Monday-Saturday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Frantz Coby
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2171

June 23, 2004